

## 6

## Remarks

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 18 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hill '994.

In responding to these rejections, the Applicant has replaced former claim 1 with new claim 19. New claim 19 includes the limitations of former claims 3, 5 and 6 and 7 and more clearly specifies the structural relationships among the elements recited. In particular, new claim 19 specifies that the camera optics incorporates focusing means and means for adjustment of a camera field of view. Moreover, these focusing means and field of view adjustment means are controlled by the control device in dependence on input from the pattern or image detection device in order to cause the camera optics to output signals leading to a clear display of the object on the display unit. In contrast to these limitations, the camera unit of Hill does not contain any focusing means or field of view adjustment means which are resident on a camera per se. On the contrary, it would appear that the camera units of Hill do not contain any optical adjustment whatsoever and merely produce a CCD pixel output which is digitized and subsequently subjected to image processing. Therefore, according to Hill, the image which appears on the display is the product of signal processing located downstream of the CCD camera and is not adjusted in dependence on pattern recognition means interacting with the camera to actually change the signal output of the camera in dependence on an object which is to be displayed. This is particular evident beginning on column 4, line 55 and extending to column 5, line 26 of Hill in which the CCD cameras are discussed as well as in figure 3 showing data flow in one direction only proceeding from the CCD cameras in the front and rear portion of the vehicle. Therefore, Hill provides no

7

motivation for adjusting the camera optics or the camera field of view in order to change the signal output of the camera to present signals to the display means which are tailored to provide clear visibility of the detected object whose pattern or image has been recognized.

The dependent claims of record inherit the limitations of the base claim and have furthermore been adapted appropriately for consistency therewith. The Applicant therefore requests favorable review and passage to issuance.

No new matter has been added in this amendment.

8

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Vincent

Dr. Paul Vincent

Registration number 37,461

September 07, 2006

Date

Dreiss, Fuhlendorf, Steimle &amp; Becker

Patentanwälte

Postfach 10 37 62

D-70032 Stuttgart, Germany

Telephone +49-711-24 89 38-0

Fax +49-711-24 89 38-99